

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 17, 22 and 28 have been amended. Claim 2 has previously been canceled. Claims 37-45 have been added. Thus, claims 1 and 3-45 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 14, 17, 22 and 28-36 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,848,413 issued to Wolff, et al. (*Wolff*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,477 issued to Hull, et al. (*Hull*) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,508 issued to Epstein, et al. (*Epstein*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 4, 14, 17, 22 and 28-36 are not rendered obvious by *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Epstein*.

Claim 1 recites:

a server coupled to the filter, the server having memory to store the electronic documents, the server to publish the subset of electronic documents by selectively permitting access to the subset of electronic documents, the server further to transmit authorization information to one or more recipients, the authorization information to enable the one or more recipients to access one or more of the subset of electronic documents.

Thus, Applicants claim a server that transmits authorization information to one or more recipients.

The section of *Wolff* cited in the Office Action discloses a gateway that receives a fax document and transforms the fax document to a hypertext document. See col. 7, lines 29-30 and 40-49. The documents are stored and identifiers are provided. See col. 7, lines 58-60. However, *Wolff* does not teach or suggest sending authorization information to

one or more recipients. *Hull* is cited to teach storing documents without user intervention. See col. 6, lines 49-51. Thus, *Hull* discloses archival of documents. However, *Hull* does not disclose sending authorization information to one or more recipients.

Epstein is cited to teach content-based filtering. However, *Epstein* is not cited to teach, nor does *Epstein* teach, sending authorization information to one or more recipients. Because none of *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Epstein* teaches sending authorization information to one or more recipients in the manner recited in the claims, no combination of *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Epstein* can render the claimed invention obvious.

Claims 3, 4, 29, 30 and 37-39 depend from claim 1. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 3, 4 and 37-39 are not rendered obvious by *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Bauer* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 14 recites:

 sending a network document identifier and password for accessing
 the subset of electronic documents to predetermined recipients...

Further, claim 17 recites:

 transmitting to one or more recipients authorization information
 corresponding to the selected electronic documents...

Thus, Applicants claim providing a document identifier and a password to predetermined recipients. Claim 22 is a means-plus-function claim that recites transmitting authorization information to one or more recipients. Claim 28 is an article of

manufacture claim that recites transmitting authorization information to one or more recipients.

As discussed above, none of *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Epstein* teaches sending authorization information to one or more recipients in the manner recited in the claims. Therefore, no combination of *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Epstein* can render the claimed invention obvious.

Claims 31 and 32 depend from claim 14. Claims 33, 34 and 40-42 depend from claim 17. Claims 35, 36 and 43-45 depend from claim 28. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 31-36 and 40-45 are not rendered obvious by *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Bauer* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 8-13, 15, 16, 18, 23 and 27 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Wolff* in view of *Hull* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,188,673 issued to Bauer, et al. (*Bauer*). Claims 8-13 depend from claim 1. Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 14. Claim 18 depends from claim 17. Claims 23 and 27 depend from claim 22.

Bauer is cited to teach maintaining access logs on a server that provides access to electronic documents. Whether or not *Bauer* discloses access logs, nothing in *Bauer* teaches or suggests sending authorization information to recipients as discussed above. Therefore, *Bauer* does not cure the deficiencies of *Wolff* and *Hull*. Thus, no combination of *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Bauer* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 8-13, 15, 16, 18, 23 and 27.

Claims 5-7, 19-21 and 24-26 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Wolff* in view of *Hull* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,777 issued to Skarbo, et al. (*Skarbo*). *Skarbo* is cited to teach auto-deletion of an electronic document. Whether or not *Skarbo* discloses auto-deletion, *Skarbo* does not cure the deficiencies of *Wolff* and *Hull* as described above. Therefore, no combination of *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Skarbo* teaches or suggests the invention as claimed in claims 5-7, 19-21 and 24-26.


Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1 and 3-45 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date:

July 12, 2004


Paul A. Mendonca
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778